IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

STEVEN B. BARGER,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Case No. 1:17-cv-04869-FB-LB
FIRST DATA CORPORATION, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXPEDITE/SHORTEN TIME FOR RULE 72(a) OBJECTION

Defendants First Data Corporation, Frank Bisignano, Anthony Marino, Dan Charron, Rhonda Johnson, and Karen Whalen (collectively, "Defendants") respectfully submit their Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite/Shorten Time for Rule 72(a) Objection¹ and, as grounds therefore, state as follows:

- 1. On September 4, 2018, Magistrate Judge Bloom held oral argument on Plaintiff's four pending motions to compel and, among others, denied Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Rule 30(b)(6) Depositions.
- 2. Nine days later on September 13, 2018 at 10:56 p.m., Plaintiff filed a Motion pursuant to Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, seeking to overturn Judge Bloom's September 4, 2018 Order regarding the denial of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel 30(b)(6) depositions. ECF No. 64.

¹ For purposes of this Opposition, Defendants assume that the Plaintiff's Rule 72 Motion is not a discovery motion that would be subject to Judge Bloom's rules requiring no more than a 3 page letter brief (*see* J. Bloom Indiv. Rule 5.A), or this Court's rules requiring a request for premotion conference (*see* J. Block Indiv. Rule 2.A).

- 3. Plaintiff now moves to expedite the briefing schedule on the Rule 72 Motion, requesting the Court to order that Defendants file their Opposition by this Friday, September 21, 2018, when it would otherwise be due on Thursday, September 27, 2018. ECF No. 66.
- 4. Plaintiff's instant filing consists of a 25 page motion, with 25 footnotes and 130 additional pages of exhibits.
- 5. The Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur begins tomorrow evening, September 18, 2018, and continues until the following evening of September 19, 2018, during which time lead counsel for Defendants will be observing the religious holiday.
- 6. Given the time and resources required to oppose such a filing, it is unduly burdensome and highly prejudicial to impose a deadline of this Friday on Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's latest motion.
- 7. Rather than ask this Court to consider extending discovery for the limited purpose of taking the 30(b)(6) depositions beyond the discovery cutoff in the unlikely event that it determines that Magistrate Bloom's Order was clearly erroneous, the standard under Rule 72 to overturn her rulings, Plaintiff instead asks the Court to shorten the time for Defendants to respond. In addition, Plaintiff in his Rule 72 Motion unilaterally proposes that this Court order depositions to be completed in Brooklyn on September 27 and 28, 2018, regardless of counsel or witness availability.

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate the need to shorten time for Defendants to respond to his Rule 72 Motion. For all of the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite/Shorten Time for Rule 72(a) Objection should be denied.

Dated: September 17, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gary B. Eidelman

Gary B. Eidelman Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP 500 East Pratt Street, Suite 900 Baltimore, Maryland 21202 T: (410) 332 8975 gary.eidelman@saul.com

Gillian A. Cooper Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP 650 College Road East, Suite 4000 Princeton, New Jersey 08540 T: (609) 452 5021 gillian.cooper@saul.com

Attorneys for Defendants